

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 4 – 14 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2 and 4 – 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,211,858 (“Moon1”) and Moon, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,662 (“Moon2”). Applicants respectfully traverse the pending rejections.

Independent claims 1 and 8 both require “upon receipt of a user input indicating a desire to view the hidden notification area icons, redisplaying the hidden notification area icons in the notification area and repeating said monitoring and said hiding.” Regarding this claim step, the Office Action states “Moon1 fails to explicitly [teach] redisplaying the hidden notification area icons in the notification area upon receipt of a user input indicating a desire to view the hidden notification area icons.” Thus, the Office Action relies on Moon2 to teach this claim element.

Moon2 has been discussed at length during the prosecution of the present application. In response to previous rejections relying on Moon2, Applicants amended the claims and successfully distinguished the final limitation of claims 1 and 8 from Moon2. Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner’s attention to the previous non-final Office Action, which is dated June 8, 2006. In this Office Action, the Examiner states, “[Moon2] fails to explicitly teach upon receipt of a user input indicating a desire to view the notification area icon, redisplaying the notification area icon in the notification area and repeating the monitoring and hiding.” See Office Action of June 8, 2006, p. 4. A similar finding by the Examiner was made in the Office Action dated September 7, 2005 on page 4. (“[Moon2] fails to explicitly teach upon

receipt of a user input indicating a desire to view the notification area icon, redisplaying the notification area icon in the notification area.”). Given these correct statements by the Examiner in previous Office Actions (and in light of the previous arguments presented by the Applicants), Applicants respectfully submit that the present rejection cannot be maintained.

Indeed, Moon2 handles inactive notifications by redisplaying them in a history file. Moon2, col. 5, ll. 7-9. Moon2 does not redisplay the notification area icon in the notification area, as required by the methods of claims 1 and 8. Therefore, neither Moon1 nor Moon2 discloses “upon receipt of a user input indicating a desire to view the hidden notification area icons, redisplaying the hidden notification area icons in the notification area and repeating said monitoring and said hiding.” The combination of Moon1 and Moon2 does not teach the methods recited by claims 1 and 8, and, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and claim 8 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2, and 4-7, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 9-14, which depend from claim 8, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 2, and 4 – 14 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1, 2, and 4 – 14. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/rhr/ Robert H. Reckers

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

RHR
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547